What Kennedy Ought to Do About Cuba, Pps. 2-3

And Now It's Un-American to Be Frivolous About the Communist Party—See Page Four

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IX, NO. 9 MARCH 13, 1961 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Time to Get Us A New Ambassador in Leopoldville

Washington, March 8

Ghana's Nkrumah was slated to get the red carpet treatment in Washington but the cordial welcome did not include adequate press coverage of his opening speech before the UN General Assembly yesterday. Even the *New York Times* was skimpy and in the absence of a text it is impossible to learn just why his 8-point program for peace in the Congo called for the temporary withdrawal of all foreign diplomatic missions from Leopoldville. But it is possible to guess. Last September 23 in his address to the General Assembly President, Nkrumah said that "but for the intrigues of the colonialists a document of reconciliation which had been drafted in the presence of my Ambassador in Leopoldville and approved by both Mr. Kasavubu and Mr. Lumumba would have been signed by them." Mr. Nkrumah may feel that pacification of the country would be facilitated if Western embassies were temporarily withdrawn; the Russians and Czechs were driven out last Fall by Mobutu, to the cheers of the U.S. press. There is reason to suspect that our embassy under Clare Timberlake is one of those which has intrigued first against the Lumumba government, then for Mobutu and the secessionists, and more recently against the UN command.

Pro-Mobutu and Anti-Dayal

According to *Time* magazine last Sept. 26—it was gloating, of course, not exposing—Mobutu set up his military dictatorship after a series of visits to the U.S. Embassy and "long talks with officials there." Later in the Fall, Mr. Timberlake was the first Ambassador to pay an official call on Moise Tshombe, boosting the prestige of this puppet in secessionist Katanga, where Belgian big business and its Rockefeller allies have been able to carry on their mining operations as undisturbed as if the Congo were still a Belgian colony. Rajeshwar Dayal, the UN Chief of Mission, who has been exposing the growing Belgian control of the Kasavubu, Tshombe and Kalonji regimes in a series of reports to the UN, has earned Mr. Timberlake's enmity. Warren Unna of the *Washington Post,* visiting Leopoldville with the Mennen Williams' party, reported (March 5) one "school of thought" in the Congolese capital "accuses U.S. Ambassador Clare H. Timberlake of being so distrustful of Dayal that he has cramped his effectiveness with a personal vendetta." We give a sample on page three of the distorted anti-Dayal stories which have been leaked out to the U.S. press, and we note in a *Wall Street Journal* Washington dispatch today that "the U.S. is privately pressing in UN corridors and foreign capitals for the removal of India's Rajeshwar Dayal as UN Congo commander." The man who exposed the return of Belgian control, who reestablished some UN reputation for independence in neutralist eyes, is to be gotten rid of. No such persistence is shown about finding Lumumba's slayers. On the contrary, on this, the atmosphere on Embassy row in Leopoldville seems quite complacent. Joseph E. Evans, reporting to the *Wall Street Journal* Feb. 24 from Leo quotes "a Western diplomatic observer" there as saying, "If Lumumba had lived, he would almost certainly have come back to power and with him the Soviets in full force." As it is, this dispatch went on, "this observer, like others, figures Soviet grand strategy for Congo control has been derailed for the time being." Presumably so noble an end justifies even murder as its means.

The UN's Main Enemy in the Congo

"The general picture is that the Belgians here, without much support from their home government and possibly with Brussels disapproving, are trying to capitalize on Congolese schisms and the general Congolese discontent with the UN to drive the UN operation out of the Congo in the hope of reestablishing control of the economy and indirectly of the political administration. . . . Belgian interests, including the Catholic Church, which is playing an ever-increasing role in Congolese politics now, control the three Leopoldville newspapers and are using them for a virulent and irresponsible campaign against the UN."

—Russell Howe from Leopoldville, Wash. Post, Mar. 7.

Our embassy in Leopoldville seems to be proceeding in a straight cold war line while the Kennedy administration has been shifting its Congo objectives. Lumumba was murdered in Katanga after the word spread that the UN with U.S. support was moving toward a new Congo government which would include Lumumba. This idea seems to have been as unwelcome to our embassy in Leopoldville as it was to the Belgians. There are moments when Mr. Timberlake seems to be operating on his own, as in the recent affair of the U.S. ships suddenly ordered to the Congo. On March 6 the State Department spokesman here announced that four naval vessels on a good-will trip to South Africa had suddenly been ordered to steam north to the Congo. Next day, however, the spokesman announced that the ships had been ordered to turn about and continue their cruise. The strange thing about this announcement is that the spokesman said the earlier "precautionary step was taken by Ambassador Timberlake . . . on his own initiative" and the Navy Department the same day said the turn-around was ordered "because their presence is not required by the United Nations in Congo waters." But questioning at State disclosed that the UN had never requested the ships in the first place and that Mr. Timberlake had asked for the ships directly to the Navy Department, only informing State about it afterward.

Since when are Ambassadors allowed to summon the Navy to action without first consulting State Department, especially in touchy situations where this would undercut declared policy, which is to seal off the Congo from intervention by any of the great Powers?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Glamorous Ideas About Counter-Revolutionary Guerrillas Are a Pipe-Dream

What Kennedy Ought to Do About Cuba Is to Reverse Eisenhower's Policies . . .

In his State of the Union message, Mr. Kennedy challenged the Communist world to "open and peaceful competition—for prestige, for markets, for scientific achievement, and even for men's minds." But how does one compete—without competing? In Cuba, so far, the Kennedy administration like the Eisenhower administration before it, is simply refusing to enter into the game. Mr. Eisenhower cut off oil, stopped buying sugar, forbade Americans to travel in Cuba and broke off relations. Mr. Kennedy's administration is reported to be planning a further step in the same direction—it is studying the advisability of ending Cuba's last imports to this country: in molasses, tobacco, fruits and vegetables. This would make the U.S. trade embargo total. Is this competition with the Soviet bloc for the market and the mind of Cuba? Or is it a petulant refusal to play?

Mr. Kennedy in his State of the Union message said that "if Freedom and Communism were to compete for man's allegiance in a world at peace, I would look to the future with ever increasing confidence." In Cuba, it is we, not the Soviet bloc, which is choosing the path of war. It is we who are training Cubans for war against the Castro government, dropping them in the Escombray, supplying them by air, encouraging and financing the formation of a rival government, doing our best to foment civil war in Cuba and trying to line up other nations in the hemisphere for collective action against her. This is not competing for allegiance in a world of peace. It is threatening to put Cuba to fire and sword because we can no longer dictate her destiny. This is exactly what we criticized when the Russians did it to Hungary.

Strange Way to Encourage Reform

Mr. Kennedy spoke of a competition between Freedom [his capitals] and Communism, but what the Central Intelligence Agency seems to be planning is to restore freedom of another kind in Cuba. If the report carried by the *Baltimore Sun* last Sunday March 5 is correct, we have forced the more liberal elements among the Cuban exiles—the exponents of *Fidelismo* without Fidel—to give in to the conservatives and agree to an economic program which would restore the land, the banks and the utilities to their former owners (see box below). We're going to lose in Latin America if we again identify that word Freedom with United Fruit, Chase Manhattan and I.T. & T. In the same State of the Union message, Mr. Kennedy said "Cuban social and economic reform should be encouraged." Is this how to encourage it?

In Havana, as I reported in the *Weekly* two weeks ago, I was appalled by the headstrong intransigeance of the Cuban leadership. Back in Washington, I do not find any greater wisdom. After a decade in which military power failed and dictators fell all over the hemisphere, we are now looking to military means again, though in a new form. This time our hopes are pinned to guerrilla forces. Just as the French rightist military in Algeria read Mao Tse-tung and tried to adopt his methods, so our leaders have begun to read Che Guevara's little handbook on guerrilla warfare and have the bright idea of adapting it to *our* needs. There has been a series of coyly boastful stories out of Fort Bragg where the Army has been training Special Services for guerrilla war.

But these stories miss the whole point. Guerrillas who offer peasants aid against a hated landlord or village usurer are one thing. But can you see a U.S. guerrilla knocking on a peasant's door late at night, "Give me water; hide me; I bring a message from United Fruit Company; we've come to take back your land"? The guerrilla's strength is his revolu-

Still Hoping for Another Guatemala

"Though the Special Forces [training for guerrilla warfare at Ft. Bragg, N.C.] are not necessarily involved, it's no secret that this country already is furnishing weapons and supplies to anti-Castro forces in central Cuba's Escambray Mountains and training counter revolutionaries in Florida and Guatemala.

"The Army, of course, insists its Special Forces are designed for use with pro-Western elements in native populations in declared wars against Red governments. But officers at Ft. Bragg and the Pentagon stress the obvious cold war potential, too. Asked if the Special Forces have ever been thus employed since their organization in 1952, and you'll get this reply: 'This is where we don't talk'. . . .

"But in at least one instance, the U.S. did successfully engineer a revolt—against the left-wing government of Guatemala in mid-1954."

—Wall St. Journal dispatch from Ft. Bragg, Feb. 27

The Kind of New Government Our Secret Agencies Are Shaping Up for Cuba

"Miami, Fla., March 4—A secret conference of anti-Castro Cuban leaders opened in Washington today. Its purpose is to choose a provisional president of Cuba and a provisional government. . . . Today's 'summit meeting' follows another secret meeting, held in New York earlier this week. At that session the warring factions of exiled Cubans buried the hatchet and agreed upon the broad outline of a common policy. . . . It includes three main points:

"1. The provisional government will favor agrarian reform as proposed in the Cuban constitution of 1940. This would permit the farmers to purchase their land.

"2. Urban banks would be returned to private ownership, whether foreign or Cuban.

"The public utilities seized by Castro would be returned to their private owners. . . .

"This week's economic agreement reached in New York is reported to be a complete victory for those Cuban leaders who are not only against Castro, but also against Castro's economic views. The other main group of Cuban exiles—the one that favors Castroism without Castro—agreed. . . .

"The word here is that the warring factions were pressured into getting together by an agency of the U.S. government. The pressure, it is stated, took the form of a threat to withdraw financial support from all the groups. According to one apparently reliable source here, the Cuban groups have been getting about $400,000 a month, presumably from the same agency.

"This source also says that certain U.S. government officials are taking part in the Washington meeting. That, according to this source, is the only reason for holding the session in Washington."

—Howard Norton in the Baltimore Sun, March 5

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Will Peasants Welcome Fighters Seeking to Take Back the Land for United Fruit?

. . . Only By Restoring Relations and Trade, Can We Combat Soviet Influence

tionary political program. Without it, he is only another version of the World War II commando, able to kill sentries and blow up bridges, but not to mobilize the masses. Does anyone believe Batista could have been saved by trained detachments from Fort Bragg? Or that Cubans would have been grateful to us for prolonging the struggle and teaching him more efficient ways of repressing them?

Brazil and Argentina Say "No"

U.S. policy has handed Cuba to Moscow on a platter. Che Guevara came back from his "shopping tour" of the Soviet bloc with an impressive list of factories for the industrialization program. At relatively small cost, in return for sugar and other products, the Soviet bloc can within a few years make little Cuba a showplace. Cuban developments can put us on the spot with the rest of Latin America. This is promising to become the biggest challenge the U.S. has ever had to face in this hemisphere. We cannot meet it with military means; privately, it seems to be admitted here that Castro cannot be overthrown by Cuban counter revolutionaries. Our present activity along these lines only has the political virtue of keeping the Eastlands and. McCormacks happy with the delusion that we are "doing something" about Castro. The possibility of getting collective action against Castro has disappeared with the failure of the Berle mission to Brazil, Venezuela's refusal to break off relations with Cuba, and Argentina's latest note to Washington. With Brazil and Argentina both opposed (Chile has since taken the same position) to collective action against Cuba, "officials here agree," E. W. Kenworthy wrote from Washington in the *New York Times* March 7, "that there is no prospect of getting action against Cuba by the OAS." Direct military intervention by U.S. forces would be folly. The longer we drift along in this posture of impotent hostility, the more firmly cemented will become the ties between Cuba and the Soviet bloc on which our policies have made her dependent.

A reversal of policy is called for. The situation might still be saved if we were prepared to swallow our pride and deal with Cuba on a basis of equality. Both Brazil and Argentina have offered to act as mediators. The Russian sugar contract—as I explained in the issue of Feb. 27—is dependent on our *not* buying Cuban sugar. Negotiations are possible linking resumption of sugar purchases with compensation for American properties. Castro himself offered this in a speech in Havana March 7. There is an extraordinary fund of goodwill toward Americans in Cuba even now. It is time the Kennedy administration abandoned the drift to war of the Eisenhower administration and got back into the fight to preserve Cuban friendship and to prevent it from becoming a Soviet satellite. This can only be done by a resumption of travel, trade and diplomatic relations. Why should we leave the Cuban industrialization program to Soviet experts? Why shouldn't we demonstrate good-will and technical capacity by offering help in this program ourselves? Just as totalitarian ideas seeped into Cuba with Soviet aid, so democratic ideas will revive with American aid and American friendship. Only we have to make up our minds whether our purpose is to save the oil and sugar companies, or whether it is to save —and restore—free institutions.

But peace with Cuba alone will not end the challenge which has emerged with Soviet aid to Castro. Only a far-sighted, long-range program, of unprecedented dimensions, can maintain U.S. prestige and hemispheric solidarity in the face of Soviet readiness to extend aid in Latin America. I want to sketch out some ideas on this in the next issue.

Trivial Liberal Victory

New electronic devices are bringing an Orwellian police state closer at a swift rate. If the Fourth amendment's guarantee of privacy against police intrusion is not to be made a dead letter, the Supreme Court must adapt it to these realities. Edward Bennett Williams, in arguing the Silverman case, pointed out that new devices now enable the police without wire-tapping to pick up conversations 300 yards away, through an open window or across a busy street. But the Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Stewart last Monday, held to the rule that eavesdropping is only unconstitutional if there has been a physical invasion of private premises. We share Mr. Justice Douglas's disgust, in his separate opinion concurring, that the Court should still rely on "the trivialities of the local law of trespass" instead of reversing past decisions which undercut the Fourth amendment "by nice distinctions turning on the kind of electronic equipment employed." In the Silverman case, it was a "spike-mike" the police used to listen in on a gambling establishment. This was disallowed only because, by a fraction of an inch it penetrated a private wall. If the police had bugged the place without physical penetration, the majority presumbaly would not have objected.

That Fake Story of How Dayal Helped the Gizenga Forces to Take Luluabourg

". . . there is the strange case of the UN refusal to interpose itself between the local pro-Kasavubu command in Luluabourg and the truck fleet of soldiers from Stanleyville who took over. Dayal claimed that Gizenga's soldiers were peacefully received. . . . The U.S. must stop standing idly by while the UN—under Dayal's one-sided policies—in effect abets Stanleyville's conquest of the Congo."

—Marguerite Higgins from Washington, N.Y. Herald-Tribune, Feb. 27.

"The [UN] Secretariat feels that Mr. Dayal has been shamefully calumniated, not only in press reports, but also by foreign governments. . . . For instance, the famous so-called capture of Luluabourg by a Gizenga force was almost entirely fabrication.

"Only 300 Gizenga partisans turned up at Luluabourg. They were outnumbered by the Mobutu troops by 10-to-one. The UN maintained a cease-fire, arranged parleys, got both sides to deposit their arms in an armoury under UN guard. Some days later, the Gizenga supporters vanished into the bush and were not spotted for 48 hours, when they were observed returning to Stanleyville. Meanwhile some Western diplomats were spreading the story of Mr. Gizenga's victory which was 'not stopped by the scandalous Dayal'."

—Philip Deane, London Observer, March 5.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Debate on That HUAC Appropriation Shows A Startling New Item in the American Credo

It's Now Un-American to Be Frivolous About the Communist Party

During the debate, if it can be called that, on the new appropriation for the House Un-American Activities Committee, Mr. Walter accused Mr. James Roosevelt of having "demonstrated a rather frivolous attitude toward the Communist party." We couldn't help thinking as we heard it that the U.S.A. is probably the only country outside the Soviet bloc where a man can make himself suspect by being "frivolous" about the Communist party.

Radio Moscow could not be more insidious than to broadcast deadpan the debate as reported in the March 1 Congressional Record. The impression it gives is that the most powerful capitalist nation on earth is terrified of communism, so terrified that to question the power of communism is to lay oneself open to suspicion of un-Americanism.

As in Iron Curtain Countries

An American must be almost as careful as a Russian when he talks of the Communist party.

Mr. Scherer of Ohio, the ranking Republican on the Un-American Activities Committee, told the House, "Anyone who says that Communist internal subversion stops short 90 miles from our shores in Cuba is either a fool or a Communist agent." Mr. Walter, rebuking Mr. Roosevelt for skepticism, said "It is admitted by all that the Communists have infiltrated every phase of our life." Only the Committee stands between them and triumph. The campaign to abolish the Committee, Mr. Dorn, of South Carolina, told the House, "is really a move to abolish our freedoms," then "eliminate Congress and enslave the American people."

This reference to slavery was not meant to be rhetorical. Only science fiction can rival the perils with which we are confronted. Mr. Fallon of Maryland told the House that the American people have become "the No. 1 target of the alien ideology that practically invented subversion and has developed it into a mighty and lethal weagon." Mr. Scherer explained that this new weapon, "internal subversion," was so powerful that "the top experts in psychological warfare frankly state that the Soviets have abandoned the centuries old concept of war." They see the Russians preparing to seize us body and soul. "They believe," Mr. Scherer went on with his tingling revelation, "that a man killed by a bullet can mine no coal, a city destroyed mill no cloth. These experts say the Soviets seek to take intact the peoples and their possessions so that they can be put to use."

Presumably all they need do is to slip *Das Kapital* into Mr. Scherer's mail and wait for the poison to work. But here, too, the Committee stands on guard. Mr. Scherer told the House that "after a long series of hearings" it had proven "conclusively that 10 million pieces of Communist propaganda in 13 different languages were coming into this country each year." The number 13 intrigues us. A less godless movement, respectful of ancient beliefs, would have added or dropped one language, just to be on the safe side. . . .

In this booby-hatch atmosphere, the 412-to-6 vote was not surprising. It is only surprising that Mr. Roosevelt did find one Congressman, William Fitts Ryan of New York willing to speak up with him on the floor and four others to join them in voting against the appropriation. To this resolute pair and to Edith Green of Oregon, O'Hara of Illinois, Kastenmeier of Wisconsin and Ashley of Ohio ought to go some kind of award. Perhaps for being the only members of Congress unafraid to show more faith in the U.S. Constitution than in the U.S. Communist Party.

They Could Go Underground And Show the Film in Secret

"The House Un-American Activities Committee is preparing material defending its controversial film, 'Operation Abolition,' the ranking minority member of the committee said this morning. Rep. Gordon H. Scherer (R. Ohio) told members of the Board of the National Federation of Republican Women about the new material when several of them said they were 'having trouble' showing the film, and asked him what to do. . . . Republican women from several States complained to Mr. Scherer that when their local Republican women's clubs showed the film, literature attacking it is handed out after the showing."

—Washington Star society page, March 3

Reprints in Bulk Available at Special Rates for Last Week's Issue on the Wilkinson-Braden Decisions

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

3/13/61

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED